



CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT
OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY
ISSUE NO. 5
JULY 1998

In this issue...

<i>Trends in Supervision</i>	2
<i>Governor Wilson Appoints New Board Member</i>	3
<i>Important Information About License Status Terms: "Inactive" v. "Retired" v. "Surrender"</i>	7
<i>Some Sound Advice</i>	8
<i>What is a Citation & Fine Order?</i>	8
<i>Guest Article: Confessions of a Spectator-Participant</i>	9
<i>Disciplinary Actions</i>	10
<i>Licensee Counts by County</i>	12
<i>Overview of Enforcement Activity: 1993-1998</i>	14
<i>October 1997 Written Exam Statistics, by Schools</i>	15
<i>January 1998 Oral Exam Statistics, by Schools</i>	18
<i>April 1998 Written Exam Statistics, by Schools</i>	21
<i>BOP Publications</i>	23
<i>1998 Board Meeting & Exam Calendar</i>	Back Cover

Message from the Chairperson

Bruce W. Ebert, PhD, JD

The *BOP Update* has been extremely well received by the public. The *Update* is designed to provide information that may assist licensees in practicing in compliance with current laws and ethical standards. It is also designed to educate consumers about the profession of psychology. As you may be aware, in 1997 the BOP went online and now maintains a very thorough and frequently updated Web page (www.dca.ca.gov/psych). This Web page incorporates all of the *BOP Updates* and includes issues of immediate interest—"News Flashes," if you will—along with links to other very important Web sites related to regulation of the profession. Additionally, the BOP Web page is the first in the Department of Consumer Affairs to allow consumers to file complaints online. Considering the power of presence on the Internet, the very well-received *BOP Update*, face-to-face meetings, and consultations with interns, supervisors, and training program coordinators across the state, and a noted presence at CPA, APA, and ASPPB functions, the Board's Consumer Education Committee has far surpassed all of our expectations for effectiveness and recognition.

For this, the fifth edition of the *BOP Update*, I have decided that it would be extremely valuable to outline and discuss issues in a number of areas noting relevant rules and regulations that may be applicable. I would like to discuss issues relating to managed care, record keeping, sex with patients, sex with former patients, exchanging information with colleagues about clients, confidentiality, competence, duty to refer, duty not to harm patients, duty to obtain informed consent from clients, truth in advertising and statements, billing practices, referral fees, and multiple-role relationships.

Managed Care Practice

There are many psychologists working in managed care settings in various administrative capacities such as managers, directors, vice presidents and senior vice presidents. Additionally, there are many psychologists who are conducting peer review, utilization review, and case management and serving as reviewers of cases where treatment or billing practices are in question. Such psychologists must adhere to the same legal

(Continued on page 4)

Highlights of Newly Approved Regulations

On April 30, 1998, the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) approved amendments to the Board's regulations regarding continuing education. The Board is committed to regularly updating the regulations for the fledgling continuing education (CE) program. The Board works closely with its Accrediting Agency and listens intently to comments from licensees. The regulatory language that was recently approved by OAL is included in this article.

One of the most important enhancements to the CE program that these regulatory changes will accomplish will be to allow credit for courses that have been reviewed and sponsored by the American Psychological Association Office of Continuing Education. This means that all the approved courses at the upcoming August 1998 APA Convention in San Francisco can count

toward the continuing education requirements. Another major change will be the exemption from the continuing education requirements for those psychologists who hold a valid California license, but who have lived in another state for at least one year out of the two-year renewal period. Previously, this exemption was granted only to psychologists living in another country.

The new regulations also allow credit for licensees who serve as examiners for the Academies of the specialty boards of the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP). The regulations will allow one hour of credit for each hour served, not to exceed four hours each two-year renewal period.

Look through the new (underlined) regulatory language that follows. As you can see, the Board continues its efforts to make the

(Continued on page 6)



Trends in Supervision

Predoctoral interns, psychological assistants, registered psychologists, trainees in exempt government or academic settings—all of these titles of people in training have one thing in common: to perform their job duties and to accrue hours that will count toward eventual psychology licensure, all of these designations require a supervisor. Supervisors bear a tremendous responsibility because it is the quality of their role as supervisors of psychologists-to-be that will shape the integrity of the future of the entire profession.

The Board is seeing more frequent incidents of supervisors failing to fulfill the legal and ethical responsibilities that go along with the title. The result of this is that more supervisors are having to be held accountable for the actions of their trainees and their own failure to properly supervise. In looking through the 150+ disciplinary decisions the Board has rendered over the past three fiscal years, we find 20 cases which involved issues related to supervisors' responsibilities. These 20 cases involved varied combinations of the following acts:

1. Failure to adequately supervise
2. Misrepresenting psychological assistant registration status
3. Supervisor aiding and abetting unlicensed (or unregistered) practice
4. Supervisor unprofessional conduct
5. Supervisee unprofessional conduct
6. Gross negligence
7. Sexual misconduct by supervisor (with supervisee)
8. Allowing supervisee to function beyond competence
9. Repeated negligent acts by supervisee
10. Fraud by supervisee
11. Inappropriate multiple role relationship by supervisor with patient
12. Breach of confidentiality by supervisor
13. Conviction of crimes by supervisee

“Experience has demonstrated that if the supervisee departs from the accepted standard of care, the supervisor is not adequately supervising him or her.”

As you can see, the spectrum of problems for supervisees covers a broad area of important issues. More often than not, a case involving one or more of the above issues will result in an enforcement case being opened on the supervisor, as well as the supervisee. The supervisor's responsibility most often includes accountability for actions of the supervisee. Experience has demonstrated that if the supervisee departs from the accepted standard of care, the supervisor is not adequately supervising him or her.

Fortunately, many of these types of cases often do not result in direct harm to the consumer and therefore can be managed and resolved through educational intervention from Board staff and/or expert consultants. For example, in cases where a supervisor of a psychological assistant has failed at one level or another to fulfill the supervision responsibilities, and consumer harm has not resulted, the matter may be resolved by the supervisor's completing an open book quiz about the laws and regulations relating to supervisor responsibilities. At other times, when a case has required review or consultation by an outside expert consultant, the matter may be resolved through an educational review during which the consultant, either in person or over the phone, will discuss with the trainee and/or supervisor the concerns that prompted the complaint and investigation.

We thought it might be helpful for supervisors, prospective supervisors, and supervisees to review a sample of the type of open book quiz that may be required to resolve some types of complaint cases involving supervisor deficiencies. The following are actual questions from an open book quiz used to resolve supervisor deficiency issues:

1 Q: Whose responsibility is it to notify patients in writing prior to the rendering of psychological services by a psychological assistant that the assistant is unlicensed and is under the direction and supervision of a licensed psychologist?

A: California Code of Regulations section 1391.6 requires that the supervisor inform each client/patient in writing prior to the rendering of services by the psychological assistant that the assistant is unlicensed and under the direct supervision of the supervisor/employer.

2 Q: Is a supervisee required to keep a written log to document hours of supervised professional experience?

A: Yes. California Code of Regulations section 1387(t) requires the supervisee to maintain a weekly log of all hours of supervised professional experience gained toward licensure.

3 Q: May a psychological assistant rent office space from his/her supervisor?

A: No. California Code of Regulations section 1391.8(c) does not allow a psychological assistant to rent, lease, sublease, or lease-purchase office space from the supervisor/employer.

4 Q: Is a psychological assistant allowed to continue to practice while his/her registration is delinquent?

(Continued on page 3)



Governor Wilson Appoints New Board Member

On December 3, 1997, the Governor's Office announced the appointment of Emil Rodolfa, PhD, to serve a four-year appointment to the Board of Psychology. The Board welcomes Dr. Rodolfa's extensive expertise in directing psychology internship training programs. Dr. Rodolfa has made a clear commitment to devoting the time, energy, and dedication necessary to be a truly effective and useful Board member.

Dr. Rodolfa received his bachelor's in psychology from San Jose State University in 1976, his master's from California State University, Hayward in 1977, and his PhD from Texas A&M in 1981. He obtained his psychology license in 1983. His professional interests include supervision and training, professional ethics, boundary issues, short-term therapy, and

anxiety disorders. He has published approximately forty papers and has made more than 100 presentations to statewide and national organizations.

Currently, Dr. Rodolfa is Associate Professor and Director of the University of California, Davis Counseling Center, and also serves as the center's Director of Training. His responsibilities include coordinating the training of six predoctoral interns in an APA-accredited internship program, four postdoctoral fellows, and eight practicum students. He has been at UC Davis since 1988. Dr. Rodolfa also is the President of the Association of Counseling Center Training Agencies (ACCTA), a national organization for university and counseling center psychology internship programs. In addition, he is Chairperson of the Council of Chairs of Training Councils (CCTC),

Dr. Rodolfa is Associate Director of the University of California, Davis Counseling Center, and also serves as the center's Director of Training.

which is composed of the chairpersons of the major doctoral-level psychology training associations in the United States.

As a member of the Board of Psychology, Dr. Rodolfa looks forward to contributing to the Board's continued effectiveness as a consumer protection agency. ♠

Trends in Supervision

(Continued from page 2)

A: No. This would be the unlicensed practice of psychology. The psychological assistant no longer holds a current and valid registration once the registration becomes delinquent due to failure to annually renew.

5 Q: Is it legal to charge supervisees a fee for supervision?

A: No. California Code of Regulations section 1391.8(a) and section 1387(r) state that no qualified supervisors may charge a fee or otherwise require monetary payment in consideration for the employment or supervision of a trainee.

6 Q: How much is the psychological assistant application fee, and who is required to pay the fee?

A: California Code of Regulations section 1392.1(a) requires the supervisor/employer of a psychological assistant to pay the \$40 application fee for registration.

7 Q: How much time must the supervisor be "on-site" when the supervisee is rendering professional services?

A: California Code of Regulations section 1387(b) (referring to ANY supervisee) and Section 1391.5(a) (referring specifically to psychological assistants) both require the qualified primary supervisor to be on-site at the same work setting a minimum of 50% of the time that the supervisee is rendering professional services.

8 Q: Is the supervisor required to have the same education, training, and experience as that of the psychological assistant?

A: California Code of Regulations sections 1391.6 (referring specifically to psychological assistants) and section 1387(d)(1) require that all qualified primary supervisors be responsible for ensuring that any supervision he/she provides is in the same or similar field of psychology as his/her own education and training.

Supervisors should not underestimate the major responsibility that goes hand in hand with being a supervisor. It is imperative that the supervisor be knowledgeable in the laws and regulations relating to the practice of psychology and be prepared to train supervisees pursuant to these rules. ♠



Message from the Chairperson

(Continued from page 1)

standards applied to the practice of psychology beginning with section 2900 et seq. of the Business & Professions Code (B&P). Section 2960 of the B&P is particularly applicable, as this section defines unprofessional conduct. Other requirements include Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR) at 1396 et seq., the APA Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (1992), and learned treatises in specific areas of practice. Clearly such practice is more organizational than clinical; nevertheless, failure to comply with any or all of the above constitutes grounds for license disciplinary action. Reports of unethical or illegal practice by HMO personnel can be made to the HMO Hotline at 1-800-400-0815 or to the BOP.

Record Keeping

Documentation of professional work continues to be an area in which the board receives a growing number of complaints. All psychologists must make notes of their contacts with clients. Record keeping is important for many reasons (see *BOP Update* Issue No. 4, October 1997). Notes should be stored in a locked and secure area to prevent unauthorized individuals from obtaining this sensitive information about your clients. Records should be maintained for several years. The APA recommends three years for the complete record and an additional twelve years for a summary of the record (APA, 1993). California law does not require a maximum time period of record retention but does allow patients to sue for damages resulting from the lack of records when a patient needs them (Health & Safety Code (H&S) section 123100, 123145). Records must be maintained for a minimum of seven years or, in the case of a minor, until one year after the minor reaches 18, but no less than seven years (H&S section 123145).

Sex With A Patient

Sex with a patient is a crime (B&P section 729), and it is always extremely harmful to the patient. Don't do it! It is also a cause for license discipline in B&P Code

section 2960(o), and such discipline is mandated to be revocation of license pursuant to B&P Code section 2960.1. It is also prohibited in the APA Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct (APA, 1992 at 4.05) and the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards Code of Conduct (ASPPB, 1991 at C(4)).

Sex With A Former Patient

Sex with former patients is prohibited in B&P Code section 2960(o), which states "...sexual misconduct which is substantially related to the qualifications, functions and duties of a psychologist or psychological assistant." **Don't do it!** There is no valid therapeutic methodology that advocates sex with former patients as helpful to the former patient. The fact is that sex with former patients is often, if not always, extremely harmful to the patient. Although the APA adopted a two-year rule by consensus (APA, 1992 at 4.07), it is bad for the patient at any time and certainly bad for the profession. If a psychologist's primary dating pool must include former patients, it is a sad statement for the profession as a whole.

Exchanging Information With Colleagues About Clients

There is an affirmative duty to share information about a client with other health care providers. There is also a statute which addresses providing such information (H&S section 123100 et seq.). Once a written release is received, signed voluntarily by a competent patient, a psychologist has no longer than 15 days to copy the records and send the records to the requesting provider (H&S 123110). There is also a duty to confer with the other provider about care of the patient, and California law provides for such a

process (Civil Code section 56.10 et seq.). A psychologist is not required to release an entire file to a patient where the patient may misinterpret mental health information and be harmed by such (H&S section 123115). A psychologist has a right to withhold raw test data for a number of reasons, including test security (CCR Title 16, Section 1396.3). There is no justification for withholding raw test data from another psychologist or in a legal proceeding in the face of a valid subpoena. A psychologist may ask for a protective order in a legal setting.

Confidentiality

The cardinal rule is "don't disclose" (Evidence Code section 1010 et seq. and Civil Code section 56.10, APA, 1992 at Standard 5, B&P section 2960(h)). There are many exceptions to the rule, especially in the area of child, elder, and dependent adult abuse reporting; Tarasoff warnings; judicial orders; releases signed by the patient; or in a legal dispute between a psychologist and a patient. If a psychologist has doubts about what to do, the psychologist should seek consultation! It must also be remembered that HIV status is protected under confidentiality rules, and that disclosure is not allowed in a situation where the patient may engage in unprotected sex with an unknowing partner.

Competence

Psychologists must remember to ensure that the extent, kind, and quality of the psychological functions they perform are consistent with their education, training, and experience (B&P section 2960(p) and APA Code of Conduct at 1.04). Training may include coursework, supervision, ongoing consultation, continuing educa-

(Continued on page 5)



Message from the Chairperson

(Continued from page 4)

tion programs, and/or participation in certificate programs. Keeping current takes work, effort, and dedication. It may involve reading journal articles, joining a journal club, attending continuing education workshops, taking classes at a university, attending meetings or a professional association, writing, teaching, Internet research and study, or other activities designed to keep psychologists current and to advance their skills. And finally, another part of competence is practicing without impairment.

Duty To Refer

Every psychologist has a duty to manage a client's care properly. This may involve referring a client to another professional for services. The most common situation relates to medical care. There is an affirmative duty to evaluate whether clients may have medical problems which may be a factor in their psychological condition and to make a referral to a physician for evaluation and care. It is important to refer patients with serious disorders who could benefit from psychotropic medication to a psychiatrist or other properly trained physician and coordinate care with that other professional. A psychologist may not prescribe drugs (B&P section 2904). However, a psychologist may discuss medication with a client (see Littrel and Ashford, 1995; also see *Special Section on Collaboration Between Psychologists and Family Practice Physicians* edited by Kenkel, 1995; also see U.S. Constitution Amendment 1). There may even be an obligation to do so in the management of a patient. A client may need the help of an attorney, accountant, teacher, education center, religious guide, or some other professional.

Duty Not To Harm Patients

The practice of psychology should not involve the intentional harm of a patient or client...above all else, do no harm! Behavior that reflects poor judgment or intentional misbehavior resulting in harm is unethical and unlawful.

Duty To Obtain Informed Consent From Clients

Psychologists have an affirmative duty to disclose fees, services, limits of confidentiality, record keeping practices, and any facts which might lead a reasonable client to obtain services or to reject services. This issue was discussed in detail in *BOP Update* Issue No. 3, January 1997.

Truth In Advertising and Statements

There is an affirmative duty to be honest and complete in statements made to the public about one's practice of psychology (B&P section 17500, given additional authority in B&P section 2960(g)). Public statements include those in formal advertising in a newspaper, mailings, or television. They also include statements made in speeches, while teaching, and when addressing the public in any manner.

Honest Billing Practices

Simply put, billing fraud is illegal. A psychologist cannot waive a co-payment. A psychologist must bill only for services provided and must NEVER bill for clients not seen.

Referral Fees

Referral fees are unlawful (B&P section 2960(f); B&P section 650; *Mast. v. State Board of Optometry*, (1956) 139 CA2d 78, 293 P2d 148).

Multiple-Role Relationships

Not all multiple-role relationships are unethical (APA Code, 1.17). Only those that cause a significant conflict of interest, are exploitative, or harm a client are prohibited. Rules regarding such prohibitions do not only apply to psychotherapy clients but could also apply to supervisees, students, I/O clients, etc. A word of caution would clearly indicate that this section of the APA Ethical Principles could never be used to justify, for example, a sexual relationship with a current or former patient, borrowing money from a patient, engaging in insider trading with a patient, or hiring a patient to perform work for you.

IN CONCLUSION, all psychologists are responsible for being aware of an abundance of issues and information. We hope that this issue of the *BOP Update* will make such efforts on the part of each and every licensee a bit more convenient.

The past year has been one of the most challenging and exciting that I have experienced as Chairperson of the Board of Psychology. The Board has successfully made it through a rigorous Sunset Review process, the oral exam has withstood yet more legal challenges, the Board has been internationally recognized by the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards, and the Board has entered cyberspace with a Web page that has set a model for other boards in California and throughout the U.S. and Canada. We look forward to accomplishing even more good work in the coming months and years. To the majority of psychologists who are working ethically and lawfully for the good of consumers, the Board salutes you! ♠

Bruce W. Ebert

References

- American Psychological Association (1992). *Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct*. *American Psychologist*, 47(12), 1597-1611.
- American Psychological Association (1993). *Record Keeping Guidelines*. *American Psychologist*, 48(9), 984-987.
- Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards (1991). *ASPPB Code of Conduct*. Author: Montgomery, AL.
- Littrell, J & Ashford, J.B. (1995). Is It Proper to Discuss Medications with Clients? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 26(2), 117-147.
- Kenkel, M.B. (1995) *Psychology and Primary Care/Family Practice Medicine*. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 26(2), 117-147.
- Mast. V. State Board of Optometry*, (1956) 139 CA2d 78, 293 P2d 148).



Highlights of Newly Approved Regulations

(Continued from page 1)

CE program more user-friendly while ensuring top quality training to prepare psychologists for evolving trends in the profession and innovation in therapy techniques while remaining within the accepted standards of care.

BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS ORDER OF ADOPTION

The Board of Psychology adopts and amends regulations in Division 13.1 of Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations as follows:

1. Subsections (b), (d) and (f) of section 1397.61 are amended to read:

1397.61. Continuing Education Requirements.

(b) Pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 29, all licensees shall take a continuing education course in the detection and treatment of alcohol and other chemical substance dependency. The course shall be not less than seven hours in length and its content shall comply with the requirements of section 29 of the Business and Professions Code. This is a one-time only continuing education requirement for licensure renewal and must be completed prior to the licensee's first renewal after January 1, 1997. It is the responsibility of the individual psychologist to report the completion of the CE course in the detection and treatment of alcohol and other chemical substance abuse to the Board of Psychology on the license renewal application. (This subsection shall become inoperative on January 1, 1999.)

(c) Any person renewing his or her license on or after January 1, 2000 shall provide written evidence of completion of a continuing education course of no less than four hours in length in the subject of laws and ethics for each license renewal cycle. This course shall cover laws and regulations related to the practice of psychology; recent changes/updates in

ethics codes and practice; current accepted standards of practice; and application of ethical principles in the independent practice of psychology. It is the responsibility of each licensee to certify, under penalty of perjury, to the completion of this course to the Board of Psychology as indicated on the license renewal application.

~~(e)~~ (d) . . . (No other changes)

~~(d)~~ (e) American Psychological Association approved continuing education courses as defined in section 1397.60(c) and (d) of these regulations shall be accepted for credit only if the course has been ~~sponsored or cosponsored by the American Psychological Association Continuing Education Committee reviewed and sponsored by the American Psychological Association Office of Continuing Education. All course completion certificates meeting this requirement must certify that the specific course has been reviewed and sponsored by the American Psychological Association Office of Continuing Education.~~ Any licensee who receives approved continuing education course credit hours from an American Psychological Association ~~Continuing Education Committee sponsored or cosponsored course~~ Office of Continuing Education reviewed and sponsored course shall submit verification of course completion and the participant reporting fee specified in section 1397.69 to a board recognized accrediting agency.

~~(e)~~ (f) . . . (No other changes)

~~(f)~~ (g) Courses taken in grand rounds or in an in-service training program from a provider who meets the qualifications set forth in section 1397.65 shall be accepted for credit provided they meet the hour value requirements in sections 1397.60(c) and 1397.63(a). Licensees participating in grand rounds or in in-service training programs for the purpose of meeting continuing education requirements may receive one hour of continuing education credit for each sixty minutes of participation in such activities. ~~Any licensee who receives continuing education credit by participating in grand~~

~~rounds or in-service training programs shall submit verification and the course attendee fee specified in section 1397.68 to a board recognized accreditation agency.~~

Note: Authority cited: Sections 2915(g) and 2930, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Sections 29 and 2915, Business and Professions Code.

2. Subsection (a) of section 1397.62 is amended to read:

1397.62. Continuing Education Exemptions.

At the time of making application for renewal of a license, a psychologist may request a waiver from completion of the continuing education requirements. The board shall grant a waiver only if the psychologist verifies in writing that, during the two year period immediately prior to the expiration date of the license, he or she:

(a) Has been residing in another country or state for at least one year reasonably preventing completion of the continuing education requirements;
or * * *

Note: Authority cited: Sections 2915(g) and 2930, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 2915, Business and Professions Code.

3. Subsection (b) of section 1397.63 is amended to read:

1397.63. Hour Value System.

~~(b)~~ (1) Licensees who serve the Board of Psychology as commissioners on any oral examination pursuant to section 2947 of the code or as selected participants in any written or oral examination development related function will receive four hours of continuing education credit for each full ~~days~~ day's service. Licensees who serve as commissioners on any special oral examination will receive one hour of continuing education credit for each hour served, not to exceed four hours. Selected board experts will receive one hour of continuing education credit

(Continued on page 7)



Important Information About License Status Terms:

“Inactive” v. “Retired” v. “Surrender”

Quite often the Board’s staff receives inquiries for advice on how to handle license status issues from licensees who are retiring from practice, who are moving out of state or country, or who for whatever reason have no need to keep their licenses in active status. These licensees do not want their licenses to slip into delinquent or canceled status due to failure to pay the active renewal fees. We often are asked by such licensees if they can “retire” their licenses. Occasionally we are asked if they can simply “surrender” their licenses. The Board does not have the authority to place a license in a “retired” status. Further, licenses may only be “surrendered” as a settlement in a disciplinary case after charges have been

filed. Clearly, this would not be a suitable disposition for a licensee simply choosing to retire or to move out of state. Fortunately, however, there is a very viable and convenient alternative for such individuals.

Psychologists retiring from practice or leaving the state or country may choose to place their licenses on “inactive” status. This can be done at any time simply by making a written request to the Board. When a license is placed on “inactive,” the biennial (every two years) renewal fee is reduced from the active fee of \$475 to the inactive fee of \$40. Further, when a license is inactive, the requirements for continuing education are waived. Clearly, for the genuinely retired psychologist,

placing the license in “inactive” status has true advantages.

It must be made clear that having a psychologist license on “inactive” status means that the holder of the inactive license cannot engage in the practice of psychology; however, an “inactive” person may use the title “psychologist.” To engage in the practice of psychology while holding an inactive license would result in charges of unlicensed practice, which is a criminal action, and in subsequent discipline against the license.

To return to “active” status, an “inactive” person need only pay the active renewal fee and certify to meeting continuing education requirements. ♣

Highlights of Newly Approved Regulations

(Continued from page 6)

for each hour attending Board of Psychology sponsored Expert Training Seminars. Attendance at the Annual Meetings and/or Midwinter Meetings of the Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards as a Board of Psychology Delegate shall count on an hour-for-hour attended basis, up to six hours of credit for each meeting. Any licensee who receives approved continuing education credit as set forth in subsection (b)(1) shall submit verification and the course attendee fee specified in section 1397.68 to an accreditation agency shall have his/her credit reported by the board to the board recognized accrediting agency.

(2) Licensees who serve as examiners for the Academies of the specialty boards of the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP) will receive one hour of continuing education credit for each hour served, not to exceed four hours each two year renewal period. Any licensee who receives continuing education credit as set forth in subsection (b)(2) shall submit verification and the course

attendee fee specified in section 1397.68 to the board recognized accreditation agency.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 2915(g) and 2930, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 2915, Business and Professions Code.

4. Subsections (b) and (h) of section 1397.65 are amended to read:

1397.65. Requirements for Approved Providers.

(b)(1) Upon satisfactory completion of the provider requirements of the accreditation agency, including payment of the appropriate fees and receipt of written approval therefrom, a continuing education provider may present itself as a California approved provider of continuing education courses for psychologists for one year.

(2) Upon presentation of satisfactory evidence, organizations approved by the American Psychological Association (APA) as Sponsors of Continuing Educa-

tion for Psychologists will be recognized as California approved providers of continuing education courses for psychologists during the duration of their APA approval, and shall be exempt from the annual continuing education provider fee described in section 1397.68. Such APA providers shall be held to all other requirements of California approved providers of continuing education for psychologists.

(h) The approved provider’s advertisements for approved courses shall clearly indicate the provider’s name, **primary instructor’s license number (if applicable)**; course title, course approval number, the number of credit hours, and the name of the accrediting agency.

Note: Authority cited: Sections 2915(g) and 2930, Business and Professions Code. Reference: Section 2915, Business and Professions Code.

5. Form No. 07M-BOP-14 as referenced in section 1397.65(e) is amended. ♣



Some Sound Advice...

No state or province in North America has yet passed legislation allowing psychologists to prescribe medication. Questions have arisen from some individuals associated with or who have completed training from and have been board-certified by the International College of Prescribing Psychologists' Register in psychopharmacology with a designation of "FPPR" and "diplomat-fellow prescribing psychologist." Because prescribing drugs is currently NOT within the scope of practice of psychologists in California, use of the title "prescribing psychologist" is not legal. Such a designation misleads consumers to believe that the psychologist is authorized to prescribe medication.

Although the Board of Psychology does not regulate use of designations of

certifications of diplomate status or other types of professional specialty recognition, the Board of Psychology is concerned about and does have authority to take action against licensed psychologists who engage in false advertising. Therefore, if a diplomate status from any organization is being used on a psychologist's letterhead, business card, or in any other type of public display, the diplomate must be a legitimate designation that truly exists and one that is granted by a real organization, or it would amount to false and misleading advertising. Any professional designation that uses the term "prescribing psychologist" or implies that the psychologist holder of the designation may prescribe medication is false and misleading and, therefore, illegal in California.

The Board has received many consumer complaints in recent months against psychologists who are not exercising caution in advertising professional designations received from the International College of Prescribing Psychologists' Register. Such complaints will result in contact from the Board with direction to cease and desist false and misleading advertising.

Please exercise discretion and care in choosing to advertise professional qualifications. Inasmuch as prescribing medication by psychologists is currently illegal in all of North America with rare exception, it should be a simple feat to avoid such advertisement problems by simply not making any inferences regarding the issue of prescribing medications by psychologists. ♠

What is a Citation & Fine Order?

A citation and fine order is an alternative means by which the Board of Psychology can take an enforcement action against a licensed or unlicensed individual who is found to be in violation of the Psychology Licensing Law. The citation and fine program increases the effectiveness of the Board's disciplinary process by providing a method to more effectively address relatively minor violations which normally would not warrant more serious license discipline in order to protect the public. Citations and fine orders are not formal disciplinary actions, but they are matters of public record. A list of citable violations and the range of fines associated with each can be found in the California Code of Regulations, Title 16, Division 13.1, Article 9, Section 1397.50. A citation and fine order typically contains a description of the violation, an Order of Abatement which directs the subject to discontinue the illegal activity, a fine (based on the gravity of the

violation, intent of the subject, and the history of previous violations), and procedures for appeal. Payment of a fine does not constitute an admission of the violation charged, but serves as a satisfactory resolution of the citation and fine order.

Below is the process after a citation and fine order is issued:

- a. Pay fine/comply with Order of Abatement and case is closed.
- b. Request informal conference if you feel citation and fine is unwarranted or there are mitigating circumstances.
- c. New citation issued—pay fine/comply with order (if applicable) and case is closed.
- d. Request formal hearing before an Administrative Law Judge (if dissatisfied with new citation).
- e. Initiate the appeal process (if dissatisfied with formal hearing results).

Since the beginning of the Board's

citation and fine program on April 26, 1996, the Board has issued nine citations. Usually the Board issues an informal warning before a citation and fine order is issued. If the warning results in the discontinuance of the illegal behavior, there is no need for a subsequent citation and fine order.

A copy of the Laws and Regulations Relating to the Practice of Psychology, which contain the regulations relating to the citation and fine program, is available by sending a written request to the Board of Psychology, 1422 Howe Avenue, Ste. 22, Sacramento, CA 95825, accompanied by a check payable to the Board of Psychology in the amount of \$4. The laws and regulations also are accessible through the Board's website (www.dca.ca.gov/psych). For the regulations, simply click on "Links," then on "Regulations Relating to the Practice of Psychology." For the laws, click on "California Business and Professions Code." ♠



Guest Article

Confessions of a Spectator-Participant

Terry Marks-Tarlow, PhD

The Board of Psychology is committed to including guest articles in every BOP Update. Terry Marks-Tarlow, PhD, has a long history of attending Board meetings and serving the Board as an oral commissioner. She has submitted the following article for the BOP Update 5. The Board of Psychology takes no responsibility for the accuracy or veracity of any comments or statements contained in a guest article, and the Board remains neutral on any position statements made in a guest article. The Board of Psychology thanks Dr. Marks-Tarlow for her personal commitment in attending and participating at Board meetings over so many years and for the time she has taken to submit the following article to the BOP Update.

My first dealings with the Board of Psychology (BOP) were in 1985. As I sat in the dreaded waiting room for the Oral Exam, mythic images of demonic figures loomed. In my mind's eye, they would sniff out my imposter status, and snuff out my incipient professional life, jealously guarding their lair.

Despite my fears, I made it through the exam, encountering two very nice people along the way. Much to my relief, I passed. Subsequently, I developed a view of the licensing exam as a rite of passage, during which a mirror is held up to the professional self. The mirror reflects all our innermost fears and foibles, challenging us to accept ourselves just as we are, while moving on to a new stage of professional individuation.

A year after becoming licensed, I joined the Board of the Los Angeles Society of Clinical Psychologists (LASCP). Although apolitical by nature, I was eventually talked into attending BOP meetings as a spectator. I was to report back significant happenings to my colleagues.

The first time I attended, flashbacks of the Oral Exam were evoked. I obsessed over what to wear, felt my heart beating as I approached the room, and then had the nightmare experience I had previously feared, but not experienced. Not knowing

the rules of protocol, and being somewhat impulsive, I found myself with strong feelings about the regulations under discussion. I spoke right up, and got soundly rebuked by the then BOP Chairperson for requesting information during an action time. I was greatly embarrassed and horrified at my own ignorance.

In the aftermath, I was determined to sit and watch, learn how the BOP operated, and not open my mouth again until I knew what I was doing. At the time I began attending, the meetings were quite formal and, while open to public attendance, they nonetheless did not encourage any meaningful public participation.

Over time, a remarkable thing began to happen. As a new generation of BOP members was appointed, and more representatives from local psychological organizations appeared, a spirit of dialogue was cultivated. Meetings were conducted in a relaxed atmosphere, and spectators were greeted and welcomed into discussion. It became apparent that everybody benefitted through open sharing of different perspectives.

Misconceptions among psychologists regarding the mandate and activities of the BOP became part of the discussion. BOP members recognized that the hysteria that some factions of our community had reached was counterproductive to the mandate of protecting the consumer. Fearful fantasies about "unfair and punitive procedures" had been fueled by a perceived air of silence and secrecy that shrouded BOP activities.

Meanwhile, in my own local organization, LASCP, the Senior Clinicians Circle (SCC) became politically galvanized. The SCC began looking into issues such as due process, the investigation process, use and selection of experts, and respective roles of staff and appointed BOP members. The SCC focused on the procedures involved in disciplinary matters, rather than on particular cases. Soon, SCC members found themselves in informal dialogue with various BOP members and staff, which led to changes that addressed some of their concerns. For example, a written document entitled "Spectrum of

Disciplinary Actions" was produced by the Board staff which enumerated a range of alternatives the staff implements in response to consumer complaints. Also, criteria for serving as an expert were better defined and selection procedures formalized.

For members of a board that is sometimes reputed to be indifferent, unaware, or rigid, they showed a surprising degree of concern, accessibility, and an open attitude. The importance of psychologist education came to light. BOP members began more active participation in local conventions and organizational meetings, where they presented programs and discussed important issues. A consumer education committee developed in the BOP, devoted partly to MCEP issues and to educating psychologists. For the first time, the BOP published a newsletter to update licensees on changes in policy and regulations and to alert them to other important issues.

This spirit of dialogue and openness to addressing problematic issues filtered up to the level of the state organization. The California Psychological Association is now engaging in formal exchange to address all the above issues as well. The licensee community is gradually becoming politicized, a shift from their former apolitical and exclusive interest in the intrapsychic world. For example, when the profession was young, many practitioners were opposed to being regulated, and, once regulated, neglected to develop a strong legislative lobby.

Over the past ten years, I have become less naive. I now view my former complacency as the problem. I had made certain erroneous assumptions, among them that the BOP exists in order to protect me; that the BOP is always right; that the disciplinary process is not fundamentally adversarial; and that if I just minded my own business and practiced in an ethical and professional manner, I would be completely safe from complaints and disciplinary proceedings.

I have come to realize that my professional survival depends upon my political

(Continued on page 17)



Disciplinary Actions

SEPTEMBER 1, 1997-JUNE 30, 1998

NOTICE: Decisions become operative on the effective date, except in situations where the licensee obtains a court-ordered stay, which may occur after the publication of this newsletter. For updated information on stay orders and appeals, you may telephone (916) 263-0321 and speak to the Board's Enforcement Analyst. To order copies of these decisions and other documents, send your written request, including the name and license number of the licensee, to the attention of the Enforcement Program at the Board's offices in Sacramento. Please note that there is a minimal copying charge for these documents.

**Bennett, John David, PhD (PSY 4119)
Fresno, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective April 1, 1998. License surrender.

**Bixler, Andrew T., PhD (PSY 10296)
Dover-Foxcroft, ME**

B&P Code 2960, 2960.6(a). Unprofessional conduct and disciplinary action taken by another state agency or county regarding the practice of psychology. Decision effective May 1, 1998. License revoked.

**Breit, Patricia, PhD (PSY 12282)
Huntington Beach, CA**

B&P Code 2960(j)(o), 726, 729. Found guilty of sexual misconduct, gross negligence, and unprofessional conduct with one patient. Decision effective February 4, 1998. Revoked.

**Crowe, Donald, PhD (PSY 7188)
Oakland, CA**

B&P Code 2960(j). Found guilty of gross negligence in the treatment of one patient. Stipulated Decision After Remand effective February 9, 1998. Revocation, stayed, 5 years' probation.

**Eglash, Albert, PhD
San Luis Obispo, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective June 26, 1998. License surrender.

**Esposito, Michelene, PhD (PSY 13173)
Bryn Mawr, PA**

Admits there is a factual basis for failing to maintain appropriate professional boundaries. Stipulated Decision effective December 13, 1997. Revocation, stayed, 5 years' probation.

Glasser, Anne O., PhD (PSY 9378)

Stipulated Decision effective May 21, 1998. Voluntary license surrender.

**Graham, Clifford, PhD (PSY 5631)
Redding, CA**

No admission to charges of gross negligence. Stipulated Decision effective December 12, 1997. Must attend an educational review, then Accusation will be withdrawn.

**Gustafson, Eric, Psy.D. (PSY 13604)
Covina, CA**

Stipulated Decision effective December 31, 1997. License surrender.

**Johnson, Lyle R.
Burbank, CA**

B&P Code 480, 2960(a)(b), and 2963. Admitted to a 1991 conviction of 1st degree trafficking in opiate derivatives and that he used a controlled substance to an extent or in a manner dangerous to himself or others. Stipulated Decision effective October 8, 1997. Issue 5-year probationary psychological assistant registration if/when an application is received and approved by the Board.

**Kreedman, Barbara T., PhD (PSY 8253)
Palm Desert, CA**

B&P Code 2960(j)(o). Found guilty of sexual misconduct & gross negligence in the treatment of one patient. Decision effective October 26, 1997. Revoked. Decision stayed by Superior Court on October 26, 1997, pending a hearing.

**Lovern, John D., PhD (PSY 5064)
Orange, CA**

B&P Code 2960(j)(p). Admits to gross negligence and functioning outside his

Explanation of Disciplinary Language

Revoked—The license is cancelled, voided, annulled, rescinded. The right to practice is ended.

Revoked, stayed, probation—“Stayed” means the revocation is postponed, put off. Professional practice may continue so long as the licensee complies with specific probationary terms and conditions. Violation of probation may result in the revocation that was postponed.

Suspension—The licensee is prohibited from practicing for a specific period of time.

Gross negligence—An extreme departure from the standard of practice.

Default decision—Licensee fails to respond to Accusation by filing a Notice of Defense, or fails to appear at administrative hearing.

License surrender—Resignation “under a cloud.” While charges are still pending, the licensee turns in the license—subject to acceptance by the Board. The right to practice is ended.

Effective decision date—The date the disciplinary decision goes into operation.

field of competence. Stipulated Decision effective February 13, 1998. Revocation, stayed, 7 years' probation.

(Continued on page 11)



Disciplinary Actions

(Continued from page 10)

Correction to *BOP Update 4*, page 10, in which Dr. Marks incorrectly was reported to have a stayed revocation Decision. Following is the correct report:

Marks, Clifford S., PhD (PSY 3549)
Los Osos, CA

B&P Code 2960(n), 822. Does not contest charges of mental illness and insurance fraud. Stipulated Decision effective April 24, 1997. 5 years' probation.

McCarthy, Timothy, PhD (PSY 17123)
Highland, CA

Admits to conviction of a crime and violating the terms and conditions of probation. Stipulated Decision effective January 11, 1998. Revocation, stayed, 5 years' probation.

Miller, Carolyn G., PhD (PSY 8411)
Los Angeles, CA

Neither admits nor denies charges of gross negligence, unprofessional conduct, aiding and abetting unlicensed practice, committing fraud, dishonest or corrupt acts, and misrepresentation of license status. Decision effective December 7, 1997. Revocation, stayed, 3 years' probation.

Mitroff, Norman, PhD (PSY 4032)
Novato, CA

Stipulated Decision effective September 30, 1997. License surrender.

Musser, John McCue, PhD (PSY 8289)
San Francisco, CA

B&P Code 2960(p). Admits to practicing outside his field of competence in that he lost sight of professional boundaries and own personal limitation, and contributed to the heightened anxiety, fear, depression, anger, and endangerment that his client experienced. Stipulated Decision effective March 20, 1998. Revocation, stayed, 5 years' probation.

Neuman, Gerard G., PhD (PSY 10024)
La Jolla, CA

B&P Code 2960. Admits to charges of unprofessional conduct in that he supervised a supervisee who had been his

psychotherapy client. Stipulated Decision effective March 28, 1998. Revocation, stayed, 5 years' probation.

Oliver, George, PhD (PSY 5671)
Los Angeles, CA

Decision effective October 14, 1997. License surrender.

Robbins, Mina May PhD (PSY 4885)
Sacramento, CA

No admission to charges of gross negligence and breach of confidentiality in the treatment of one patient. Stipulated Decision effective March 16, 1998. Must attend an educational review, then Accusation will be withdrawn.

Sawin, Douglas, PhD (PSY 10199)
Laguna Beach, CA

B&P Code 2960(j). Gross negligence in the treatment of one patient. Decision effective May 20, 1998. If respondent passes a psychological evaluation and the Board's oral licensing examination and obtains a practice monitor, the Accusation will be dismissed. Otherwise, the license will be placed on 5 years' probation.

Scott, Charles W., PhD (PSY 8686)
Fountain Valley, CA

No admissions to charges of gross negligence, unprofessional conduct, practicing beyond the scope of education and training, commission of fraudulent, dishonest, or corrupt acts. Stipulated Decision effective March 24, 1998. Must have a practice monitor for 6 months and take educational course work, then Accusation will be withdrawn.

Shames, Carl J., PhD (PSY 7419)
Kensington, CA

B&P Code 726, 2960(a)(i)(j)(o), and 2963. Found guilty of sexual misconduct, gross negligence, unprofessional conduct, and conviction of a crime. Decision effective October 5, 1997. Revoked.

Sorensen, Donald, PhD (PSY 353)
Marina Del Rey, CA

Stipulated Decision effective December 12, 1997. License surrender.

Spiegel, Donald, PhD (PSY 1741)
Studio City, CA

Stipulated Decision effective November 14, 1997. License surrender.

Underwood, Robert, PhD (PSY 3818)
San Francisco, CA

No admissions to charges of gross negligence and commission of fraud, dishonest or corrupt acts in the treatment of one patient. Stipulated Decision effective November 19, 1997. Must attend educational review and course work, then Accusation will be withdrawn.

Walker, Jerone S., PhD (PSY 6884)
Northridge, CA

B&P Code 2960(a). Convicted for crimes relating to and including driving under the influence of alcohol. Default Decision effective September 30, 1997. Revoked.

(Continued on page 12)

Important Address Information:

The address listed on your BOP Update mailing label is your address of record. This is the address given to the public upon request and where your license renewal forms are sent. If you wish to change this address, you must send a written request to the Board office in Sacramento either by mail or through e-mail on the Board's website (www.dca.ca.gov/psych). The Board recommends that you not use your residence address as your address of record for obvious reasons. If you have difficulty receiving mail at your office address and you do not want to use your residence address, you may want to look into renting a post office box and using that for your address of record.



Number of Licensed Psychologists by County as of May 3, 1998

Alameda..... 835	Imperial 6	Modoc..... 1	San Diego 1,137	Sonoma 227
Alpine 0	Inyo 12	Mono 3	San Francisco 669	Stanislaus 52
Amador 4	Kern 57	Monterey 80	San Joaquin 56	Sutter 4
Butte 34	Kings 3	Napa 82	San Luis Obispo 128	Tehama 2
Calaveras 4	Lake 7	Nevada 21	San Mateo 282	Trinity 1
Colusa 0	Lassen 10	Orange 951	Santa Barbara 179	Tulare 35
Contra Costa 337	Los Angeles 3,005	Placer 43	Santa Clara 543	Tuolumne 5
Del Norte 6	Madera 7	Plumas 4	Santa Cruz 99	Ventura 221
El Dorado 36	Marin 339	Riverside 167	Shasta 33	Yolo 80
Fresno 162	Mariposa 2	Sacramento 265	Sierra 0	Yuba 2
Glenn 0	Mendocino 20	San Benito 1	Siskiyou 3	Out of State 1,122
Humboldt 16	Merced 6	San Bernardino 241	Solano 58	Out of Country 56
				TOTAL 11,761

Disciplinary Actions

(Continued from page 11)

Weiss, Arnold, PhD (PSY 10224) Los Angeles, CA

Neither admits nor denies charges of gross negligence, unprofessional conduct, aiding and abetting unlicensed practice, committing fraud, dishonest or corrupt acts and misrepresentation of license status. Decision effective December 7, 1997. Revocation, stayed, 3 years' probation.

Yoon, Byung-Yul, PhD (PSY 8673) Los Angeles, CA

B&P Code 2960(j)(r). Admits to charges of gross negligence and repeated negligent acts in preparing a report of a mental status exam of a patient, in documenting the therapy provided to the patient, and in terminating therapy with the patient. Stipulated Decision effective April 9, 1998. Revocation, stayed, 3 years' probation. ♠

Important Notice:

Effective immediately, it is the policy of the Board of Psychology not to issue Psychologist initial licenses until criminal history clearances have been received from both the California Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). It may take 12 weeks or longer for both clearances to be received by the Board so you are advised to send your fingerprint cards with your application for a license. Additionally, smudged, illegible, or inappropriately applied fingerprints can result in substantial delay in this already long process. Therefore, the Board strongly encourages you to have your fingerprints completed by an experienced law enforcement agency.

It is also the policy of the Board of Psychology to not issue any Psychological Assistant registrations or Registered Psychologist registrations until clearance is received from the

California DOJ. The Board still requires FBI fingerprinting for these two registrations but will not delay the approval of the registrations for the extended time it takes to receive clearances from the FBI. Receiving clearances from the DOJ may take six weeks. However, applicants can request an "expedited" fingerprint processing by DOJ when initially submitting the fingerprint cards by paying a \$66 expedited processing fee rather than the \$55 fingerprint card standard processing fee. Again, it is vital that the fingerprints are clear and readable, as smeared, illegible, or inappropriately applied fingerprints can result in substantial further delays.

This policy is consistent with procedures of other licensing boards and with the Board's primary mission of public protection.



Number of Registered Psychologists by County as of May 3, 1998

Alameda..... 29	Imperial 0	Modoc..... 0	San Diego 52	Sonoma 0
Alpine 0	Inyo 0	Mono 0	San Francisco 20	Stanislaus 0
Amador 0	Kern 1	Monterey 2	San Joaquin 0	Sutter 0
Butte 0	Kings 0	Napa..... 1	San Luis Obispo 0	Tehama 0
Calaveras 0	Lake 0	Nevada 0	San Mateo 1	Trinity 0
Colusa 0	Lassen 0	Orange 18	Santa Barbara 0	Tulare 2
Contra Costa 19	Los Angeles 207	Placer 0	Santa Clara 15	Tuolumne 0
Del Norte 0	Madera 0	Plumas 0	Santa Cruz 1	Ventura 2
El Dorado 0	Marin 2	Riverside 0	Shasta..... 0	Yolo 0
Fresno 0	Mariposa 0	Sacramento 3	Sierra 0	Yuba 0
Glenn 0	Mendocino 0	San Benito 0	Siskiyou 0	Out of State 0
Humboldt 0	Merced 0	San Bernardino 7	Solano 1	Out of Country 0
				TOTAL 383

Number of Registered Psychological Assistants by County as of May 3, 1998

Alameda..... 109	Imperial 2	Modoc..... 0	San Diego 158	Sonoma 38
Alpine 0	Inyo 0	Mono 0	San Francisco 132	Stanislaus 5
Amador 0	Kern 8	Monterey 6	San Joaquin 5	Sutter 1
Butte 0	Kings 0	Napa..... 6	San Luis Obispo 5	Tehama 0
Calaveras 0	Lake 1	Nevada 3	San Mateo 38	Trinity 0
Colusa 0	Lassen 0	Orange 172	Santa Barbara 9	Tulare 2
Contra Costa 51	Los Angeles 538	Placer 6	Santa Clara 64	Tuolumne 0
Del Norte 0	Madera 0	Plumas 0	Santa Cruz 10	Ventura 32
El Dorado 3	Marin 36	Riverside 33	Shasta..... 6	Yolo 1
Fresno 18	Mariposa 0	Sacramento 38	Sierra 0	Yuba 3
Glenn 0	Mendocino 1	San Benito 0	Siskiyou 0	Out of State 0
Humboldt 3	Merced 6	San Bernardino 35	Solano 21	Out of Country 0
				TOTAL 1,605



Overview of Enforcement Activity

1993-1998

	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98*
CASES OPENED					
Complaints Received	561	574	584	600	425
Investigations Opened	169	163	130	145	123
Cases Sent to AG/DA	67	55	45	55	45
FILINGS					
Accusations Filed	45	31	26	34	19
Statements of Issues Filed	6	9	5	7	4
Petitions for Penalty Relief Filed	5	6	2	1	9
Temporary Restraining Order	0	0	0	0	0
Petitions to Compel Psych. Exams	2	0	1	0	1
Interim Suspension Orders	1	0	1	2	4
WITHDRAWALS/DISMISSALS					
Accusations Withdrawn	6	6	2	5	8
Accusations Dismissed	2	0	0	0	0
Statements of Issues Withdrawn	0	3	0	0	1
Statements of Issues Dismissed	0	0	0	0	0
DECISIONS (PENALTY)					
ISO/TRO Ordered	1	0	1	2	3
Revoked	13	13	8	12	8
Revoked, Stayed, Probation	8	11	8	10	11
Revoked, Stayed, Probation, Suspension	5	1	2	3	0
Voluntary Surrender	5	8	4	12	9
Two-Step Agreement	-	-	2	4	9
Petitions for Penalty Relief Denied**	2	5	2	0	2
Petitions for Penalty Relief Granted**	0	4	0	1	4
Statements of Issue - License Denied	2	4	1	2	0
Statements of Issue - License Granted	1	7	3	11	2
Orders Compelling Psych. Exam	1	0	1	0	1
Reprimand	0	2	1	2	0
Reconsideration Denied**	0	1	0	0	0
Other	1	3	2	2	1
TOTAL DECISIONS	39	59	35	61	50
DECISIONS (VIOLATION TYPE)					
Gross Negligence/Incompetence	10	13	13	12	17
Improper Supervision	-	2	2	3	1
Violation of Drug Laws	0	0	0	0	0
Self-Abuse of Drugs or Alcohol	0	0	0	0	0
Dishonesty/Fraud	1	0	0	2	1
Mental Illness	1	1	3	2	5
Aiding Unlicensed Practice	0	0	0	0	0
General Unprofessional Conduct	1	3	3	4	3
Probation Violation	2	1	1	4	1
Sexual Misconduct	12	19	5	12	9
Conviction of a Crime	4	7	2	19	6
Discipline by Another State Board	2	1	2	0	0
Voluntary Surrender	0	0	0	0	0
Interpersonal Violation	2	0	0	0	0
Other	2	2	2	2	1

* As of 5/1/98

** Not included in Decisions (Violation Type)



APPLICANT TRACKING SYSTEM • BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY
October 1997 Written Exam Statistics by Schools

School	#Applicants taking Exam	#Applicants Passing	Pass %	#Applicants Failing	Fail %
Arizona State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
American Commonwealth University, San Diego	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Brigham Young University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Biola University, La Mirada	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
California Graduate School of Psychology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
California Coast University	8	1	12.50	7	87.50
California Graduate Institute, West Los Angeles	24	10	41.67	14	58.33
California Graduate School of Family Psychology	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
California Graduate School of Marital & Family, The	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
California Institute of Integral Studies, SF	6	4	66.67	2	33.33
California School of Professional Psychology, Berkeley	42	37	88.00	5	12.00
California School of Professional Psychology, Fresno	17	11	64.71	6	35.29
California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles	69	39	56.52	30	43.48
California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego	19	15	78.95	4	21.05
California State University, Los Angeles	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Cambridge Graduate School of Psychology, Los Angeles	7	0	00.00	7	100.00
Center for Psychological Studies, Albany	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Claremont Graduate School, Claremont	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Depaul University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Forrest Institute of Professional Psychology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Fairleigh Dickinson University, New Jersey	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara	4	2	50.00	2	50.00
Florida Institute of Technology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena	4	1	25.00	3	75.00
Georgia School of Professional Psychology	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Hofstra University, Hempstead, NY	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Howard University, Washington, DC	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Illinois School of Professional Psychology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Illiois Institute of Technology	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, Menlo Park	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
International College, Los Angeles	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
La Jolla University, San Diego	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Memphis State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Michigan State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
New York University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Northern California Graduate University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Northwestern University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Nova Southeastern University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
New School for Social Research	1	1	100.00	0	00.00

(Continued on page 16)



October 1997 Written Exam Statistics

(Continued from page 15)

School	#Applicants taking Exam	#Applicants Passing	Pass %	#Applicants Failing	Fail %
Newport University, Newport Beach	4	2	50.00	2	50.00
Out-of-Country	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Oxford University, Canada	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Pepperdine University, Culver City	5	4	80.00	1	20.00
Punjab University, India	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Pacific Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto	12	12	100.00	0	00.00
Pacific Western University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Pacifica Graduate Institute, Santa Clara	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Pepperdine University, Malibu	4	4	100.00	0	00.00
Professional School of Psychological Studies, San Diego	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Professional School of Psychology	10	7	70.00	3	30.00
Rosebridge Graduate School of Integrative Psychology	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Rosemead School of Psychology, La Mirada	8	8	100.00	0	00.00
Ryokan College, Los Angeles	13	11	84.62	2	15.38
Stanford University	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
SUNY Binghamton	3	3	100.00	0	00.00
San Diego State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
San Francisco School of Psychology	4	3	75.00	1	25.00
Sierra University/A University Without Walls	5	1	20.00	4	80.00
State University of New York, Stony Brook	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
State University of New York, Buffalo	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
UC Berkeley	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
UC Los Angeles	12	10	83.33	2	16.67
UC San Diego	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
UC San Francisco	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
UC Santa Barbara	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Union Institute	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
University Alabama	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University Colorado	3	3	100.00	0	00.00
University Denver	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University Houston, Texas	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Illinois at Chicago	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University Michigan	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University North Texas	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University Pennsylvania	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University Pittsburgh	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Rhode Island	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University South Florida	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Texas, Austin	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Utah	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
United States International University, San Diego	41	20	48.78	21	51.22
University of Massachusetts, Amherst	1	1	100.00	0	00.00

(Continued on page 17)



October 1997 Written Exam Statistics

(Continued from page 16)

School	#Applicants taking Exam	#Applicants Passing	Pass %	#Applicants Failing	Fail %
University Iberoamerica, Mexico City	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University for Humanistic Studies, San Diego	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Maryland, College Park	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University of Oklahoma	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of San Francisco, San Francisco	4	3	75.00	1	25.00
University of Southern California, Los Angeles	15	8	53.33	7	46.67
University of Wisconsin, Madison	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of the Pacific, Stockton	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Wayne State University, Michigan	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Washington State University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Western American University (was Univ. of Prof. Studies)	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Western Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
William Lyon University, San Diego	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
Wright Institute Los Angeles, Los Angeles	4	3	75.00	1	25.00
Wright Institute, Berkeley	20	11	55.00	9	45.00
Wright State University, Ohio	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
TOTAL	470	299	63.62	171	36.38

Correction

In *BOP Update 4*, it was incorrectly reported on page 17 that Pacific Graduate School of Psychology had 12 candidates fail the April 1997 Examination for Professional Practice in Psychology. This number, in fact, should have been only 2 candidates who failed the written examination.

Guest Article

(Continued from page 9)

involvement. The BOP does not exist to serve psychologists; it exists to protect the public. Its fair operation depends upon a democratic process that includes checks and balances provided by the voices of those who are affected; namely, the public and the profession.

I applaud the current Board for tremendous strides in hearing our concerns and making efforts to address them. I appreciate the Board's current dedication to our education, which protects the public by helping us prevent mistakes. I support recent MCEP regulations that require each licensee to take a course in law and ethics for every renewal period. And I was delighted to be invited to write this article for the *BOP Update*.

Now the ball is in our court. I urge each and every one of you to become more involved and join our efforts. Educate yourselves about the BOP and how it

operates. Attend BOP meetings, which are open to public attendance and occur in various locations in California throughout the year. If you have questions, complaints, or suggestions, find a way to express them. You can voice your concerns collectively through representatives to the BOP from organized psychological groups, or individually by contacting staff or BOP members directly. (By the way, none of those people are demonic; at worst, they are overworked.)

Remember, the only one who can serve your interests is you. Even representatives from local and state psychological organizations carry agendas that may not dovetail with your particular interests. I have truly come to believe that continuing the process of professional individuation after licensing really does depend upon taking care of ourselves in this way. ♠

Exam Fees:

Beginning July 1, 1998, the Board will require all examination fees, written or oral, to be paid at least 30 days prior to the administration date of the examination. This authority is provided by section 2941 of the Business and Professions Code. Applicants will not be scheduled for an examination if the fee is not received by the 30-day deadline. There can be no exceptions. The next examination affected will be the October 21, 1998 administration of the EPPP.



APPLICANT TRACKING SYSTEM • BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY

January 1998 Oral Exam Statistics by Schools

(Totals include standard oral exam and jurisprudence oral exam results)

School	#Applicants taking Exam	#Applicants Passing	Pass %	#Applicants Failing	Fail %
Adelphi University	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Arizona State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
American Commonwealth University, San Diego	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Boston University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Brigham Young University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Baylor University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Biola University, La Mirada	4	2	50.00	2	50.00
California Graduate School of Psychology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
California Coast University	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
California Graduate Institute, West Los Angeles	27	10	37.04	17	62.96
California Graduate School of Family Psychology	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
California Institute of Integral Studies, SF	5	2	40.00	3	60.00
California School of Professional Psychology, Berkeley	62	26	41.94	36	58.06
California School of Professional Psychology, Fresno	16	6	37.50	10	62.50
California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles	66	37	56.06	29	43.94
California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego	36	19	52.78	17	47.22
California State University, Los Angeles	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Cambridge Graduate School of Psychology, Los Angeles	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
Center for Psychological Studies, Albany	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
Depaul University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Duke University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Florida State University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Fordham University, New York	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Forrest Institute of Professional Psychology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Fairleigh Dickinson University, New Jersey	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara	8	5	62.50	3	37.50
Florida Institute of Technology	3	3	100.00	0	00.00
Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena	10	6	60.00	4	40.00
Georgia School of Professional Psychology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Humanistic Psychological Institute	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Howard University, Washington, DC	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Illinois School of Professional Psychology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Indiana University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, Menlo Park	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
International College, Los Angeles	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
La Jolla University, San Diego	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
Loyola Marymount, Los Angeles	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Mcgill University, Quebec	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Memphis State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Michigan State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Northern California Graduate University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00

(Continued on page 19)



January 1998 Oral Exam Statistics

(Continued from page 18)

School	#Applicants taking Exam	#Applicants Passing	Pass %	#Applicants Failing	Fail %
Northwestern University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Nova Southeastern University	5	3	60.00	2	40.00
New School for Social Research	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Newport University, Newport Beach	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Northern Arizona University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Ohio State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Oklahoma State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Out-of-Country	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
Out-of-State	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
Oxford University, Canada	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Pepperdine University, Culver City	5	2	40.00	3	60.00
Professional School of Psychological Studies	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Pacific Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto	25	11	44.00	14	56.00
Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oregon	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Pacifica Graduate Institute, Santa Clara	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Pepperdine University, Malibu	6	3	50.00	3	50.00
Professional School of Humanistic Studies	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Professional School of Psychological Studies, San Diego	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Professional School of Psychology	10	2	20.00	8	80.00
Rutgers	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Rosebridge Graduate School of Integrative Psychology	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
Rosemead School of Psychology, La Mirada	10	5	50.00	5	50.00
Ryokan College, Los Angeles	14	5	35.71	9	64.29
Stanford University	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
SUNY Albany	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
SUNY Binghamton	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
San Diego State University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
San Francisco School of Psychology	5	2	40.00	3	60.00
Sierra University/A University Without Walls	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
State University of New York, Buffalo	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Teachers College, Columbia University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Temple University	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
The San Francisco School of Psychology	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
UC Berkeley	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
UC Davis	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
UC Los Angeles	10	6	60.00	4	40.00
UC Riverside	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
UC San Diego	4	2	50.00	2	50.00
UC San Francisco	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
UC Santa Barbara	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Union Institute	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
University of Arkansas	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Barcelona	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of California Santa Cruz	1	0	00.00	1	100.00

(Continued on page 20)



January 1998 Oral Exam Statistics

(Continued from page 19)

School	#Applicants taking Exam	#Applicants Passing	Pass %	#Applicants Failing	Fail %
University of Chicago	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Cincinnati	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Colorado	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Delaware	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Denver	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
University of Houston, Texas	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Illinois, Chicago	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University of Michigan	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University of Minnesota, Crookston	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Minnesota, Duluth	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Missouri, Columbia	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Missouri, Kansas City	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of North Texas	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University of Pennsylvania	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
University of Pittsburgh	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University of Rhode Island	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of South Florida	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
University of Tennessee, Knoxville	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Texas, Austin	5	4	80.00	1	20.00
University of Utah	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Virginia	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
United States International University, San Diego	33	10	30.30	23	69.70
University of Massachusetts, Amherst	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Wyoming, Laramie	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University for Humanistic Studies, San Diego	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
University of Hawaii	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University of Manitoba	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of Maryland, College Park	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of San Francisco, San Francisco	8	3	37.50	5	62.50
University of Southern California, Los Angeles	15	10	66.67	5	33.33
University of Wisconsin, Madison	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University of the Pacific, Stockton	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Wayne State University, Michigan	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Western Michigan University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Western American University (was Univ. of Prof. Studies)	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
Western Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
William Lyon University, San Diego	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Wright Institute Los Angeles, Los Angeles	8	3	37.50	5	62.50
Wright Institute, Berkeley	16	10	62.50	6	37.50
Wright State University, Ohio	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Yeshiva University, Bronx, NY	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
York University, Ontario	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
TOTAL	563	260	46.18	303	53.82



**APPLICANT TRACKING SYSTEM
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY**

April 1998 Written Exam Statistics by Schools

School	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing	Pass %	#Applicants Failing	Fail %
American Commonwealth University, San Diego	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Brigham Young University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Biola University, La Mirada	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
California Graduate School Of Psychology	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
City University Of New York	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
California Coast University	7	1	14.29	6	85.71
California Graduate Institute, West Los Angeles	16	3	18.75	13	81.25
California Graduate School of Family Psychology	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
California Graduate School of Marital & Family The	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
California Institute of Integral Studies, SF	4	2	50.00	2	50.00
California School of Professional Psychology, Berkeley	15	8	53.33	7	46.67
California School of Professional Psychology, Fresno	14	8	57.14	6	42.86
California School of Professional Psychology, Los Angeles	63	37	58.73	26	41.27
California School of Professional Psychology, San Diego	19	16	84.21	3	15.79
California State University, Los Angeles	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Cambridge Graduate School of Psychology, Los Angeles	8	1	12.50	7	87.50
Center for Psychological Studies, Albany	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
Claremont Graduate School, Claremont	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Fielding Institute, Santa Barbara	4	2	50.00	2	50.00
Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
Georgia School of Professional Psychology	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Hofstra University, Hempstead, NY	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Indiana University	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Illiois Institute of Technology	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Institute of Transpersonal Psychology, Menlo Park	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
International College, Los Angeles	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
Louisiana State Univ. & A&M College, Baton Rouge	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Lyon University, France	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Massachusetts School of Professional Psychology	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Michigan State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
New York University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Nova Southeastern University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
New School for Social Research	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Newport University, Newport Beach	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
North Texas University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Ohio State University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Out-of-country	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Out-of-state	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Pepperdine University, Culver City	2	2	100.00	0	00.00

(Continued on page 22)



April 1998 Written Exam Statistics

(Continued from page 21)

School	#Applicants Taking Exam	#Applicants Passing	Pass %	#Applicants Failing	Fail %
Punjab University, India	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Pacific Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto	7	4	57.14	3	42.86
Pacifica Graduate Institute, Santa Clara	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Pepperdine University, Malibu	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Professional School of Psychological Studies, San Diego	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
Professional School of Psychology	5	5	100.00	0	00.00
Rutgers	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Rosebridge Graduate School of Integrative Psychology	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Ryokan College, Los Angeles	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
SUNY Binghamton	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Saybrook Institute, San Francisco (AKA: Humanistic)	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Sierra University/A University Without Walls	2	1	50.00	1	50.00
The San Francisco School of Psychology	3	2	66.67	1	33.33
UC, Berkeley	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
UC, Los Angeles	6	5	83.33	1	16.67
UC, San Diego	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
UC, Santa Barbara	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
Union Institute	4	1	25.00	3	75.00
University California Irvine	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Colorado	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University Houston, Texas	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Michigan	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Minnesota, Duluth	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Missouri, Columbia	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
University Utah	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
University Virginia	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
United States International University, San Diego	26	10	38.46	16	61.54
University of Maryland, College Park	2	2	100.00	0	00.00
University of San Francisco, San Francisco	4	1	25.00	3	75.00
University of Southern California, Los Angeles	6	4	66.67	2	33.33
University of the Pacific, Stockton	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Western Michigan University	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
Washington State University	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
West Virginia University	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Western American University (was Univ. of Prof. Studies)	3	0	00.00	3	100.00
Western Graduate School of Psychology, Palo Alto	3	1	33.33	2	66.67
Western Reserve University, Cleveland	1	0	00.00	1	100.00
William Lyon University, San Diego	2	0	00.00	2	100.00
Wright Institute Los Angeles, Los Angeles	4	1	25.00	3	75.00
Wright Institute, Berkeley	12	8	66.67	4	33.33
Yale University–New Haven	1	1	100.00	0	00.00
Total for License:	319	168	52.66	151	47.34



BOP Publications



You no longer need to speak to a live person to request printed materials from the BOP. Our computer phone system is equipped to take requests for most of the Board's publications. To make such a request, simply call (916) 263-2699 and follow the computer's instructions to record your name, address, and the publications you need.

If you are ordering the *Laws & Regulations . . .*, please send your written request with a check for \$4 made out to the Board of Psychology, 1422 Howe Avenue, Suite 22, Sacramento CA 95825.

<i>Laws & Regulations Relating to the Practice of Psychology</i>	\$4
<i>Board of Psychology Disciplinary Guidelines</i>	Free
<i>All About the California Board of Psychology</i>	Free
<i>Do You Have a Complaint?</i>	Free
<i>Everybody Has Problems</i>	Free
<i>Professional Therapy Never Includes Sex</i>	
Single copies	Free
Licensees may order in bulk from the Department of General Services.	
Cost is 40 cents each, or packages of 25 for \$10 each. Call or write to	
BOP for an order form. Brochure is also available in Spanish.	
<i>Spectrum of Administrative Actions</i>	
<i>Available to the Board of Psychology</i>	Free
<i>Continuing Education Brochure</i>	Free

Did you know?

HMO Consumer Complaint Hotline: 1-800-400-0815

In the interest of consumer protection, the Board of Psychology enthusiastically supports the Consumer Complaint Hotline of the Department of Corporations. The Board encourages all licensees to post the hotline number in their offices so that HMO patients are aware of the recourse they may have in dealing with their managed care insurance carrier. A formal complaint may be filed with the Department of Corporations after a patient has attempted all available remedies within the HMO grievance system. HMO personnel who are licensed psychologists must adhere to all ethical principles applicable to the profession, as well as all laws relating to psychology licensure.

Board of Psychology

1422 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 22
SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3200
(916) 263-2699

BOP ONLINE: www.dca.ca.gov/psych

BOARD MEMBERS

Bruce Ebert, PhD, JD
Chairperson
Judith Janaro Fabian, PhD
Vice-Chairperson
Martin Greenberg, PhD
Linda Hee, PhD
Emil Rodolfa, PhD
Marilyn Palarea
Mary McMillan
Mary Ellen Early

STAFF MEMBERS

Thomas O'Connor, Executive Officer
Suzanne Taylor, Enforcement Coordinator
Jeffrey Thomas, Project Coordinator
Karen Johnson, Licensing and Examination Coordinator
Jeane Ward, Licensing Analyst
Richard Hodgkin, Licensing Analyst
Kathi Burns, Enforcement Analyst
Gia Munguia, Licensing & Administrative Services Technician
Wanda Hawkins, Continuing Education Technician
Annette Brown, Internal Business Services Technician
Mary Armstrong, Psychological Assistant Registration Technician

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY
1422 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 22
SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3200

BULK RATE
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
SACRAMENTO, CA
PERMIT NO. 685

1998 Board Meeting & Examination Calendar

DATE	EVENT	LOCATION
January 10	Oral Examination	Los Angeles
January 17	Oral Examination	Northern CA
February 20	Item Writer's Workshop	Northern CA
February 26 - March 1	ASPPB Mid-Winter Meeting	Long Beach
March 6 & 7	Board Meeting	San Diego
March 26 - 29	CPA Annual Meeting	Pasadena
March 27	Expert Training	Pasadena
April 8	Written Examination	Northern CA Southern CA
May 15 & 16	Board Meeting	Los Angeles
June 20	Oral Examination	Los Angeles
June 27	Oral Examination	San Francisco
July 17	Item Writer's Workshop	Los Angeles
August 14 - 18	APA Annual Meeting	San Francisco
August 28 & 29	Board Meeting	San Jose
October 14 - 18	ASPPB Annual Meeting	Norfolk, VA
October 21	Written Examination	Northern CA Southern CA
November 13 & 14	Board Meeting	San Diego

***The Board of
Psychology is
committed to the
protection of the
health, safety, and
welfare of consumers
of psychological
services.***

